

Comments on WT Docket 04-140

I agree with the change to allow 24-35 MHz power amplifiers because they are already prohibited in the CB radio service. It is also beneficial to enhance amplifier availability in this portion of the spectrum in this lower portion of the sun spot cycle.

I very much agree with the rule change allowing the Kenwood Sky Command as it can provide a very beneficial tool in Homeland Security situations by easily extending localized communications using HF spectrum.

I agree with the ability to conduct spread spectrum communications in the 222-225 band where there is little or no weak signal operations. I do not agree with spread spectrum operation in the 6 or 2 meter bands because there is existing weak signal experimentation that might be harmed.

I agree with your one application per applicant per vanity call sign.

I agree that retransmission between manned spacecraft and earth stations can provide additional stimulation to our youth who may become more interested in technology and ham radio.

I agree with the ability to designate a call sign to a club station in memoriam but to cut down on confusion of unnecessary use of call signs, there should be some sort of pre-agreement so that a club does not end up with 100 call signs when 100 members dies, for example.

I have no comment on the need for Part 97 waiver for CO and WY operators on 902-928 because I do not know the reason.

To maximize flexibility for Amsat and other spacecraft launching entities, I would reduce the pre-launch notifications to the maximum extent possible because those organizations have already done due diligence in identifying frequencies of operation.

I agree with your proposed change to 97.115, 97.111, 97.509(a), 97.407(b), 97.505(a).

I think that VEC should still be required to forward applications from test sessions within 10 days.

I agree that image emissions should be limited to 500 Hz or less per 97.3(c).